

**Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy**



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

PUBLIC COPY



B6

File: EAC-03-006-52277 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date: **OCT 06 2005**

In re: Petitioner:
Beneficiary



Petition: Immigrant petition for Alien Worker as a Skilled Worker or Professional pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Acting Director (Director), Vermont Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner seeks to classify the beneficiary pursuant to section 203(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(3) as a skilled worker. The director determined that the petitioner failed to establish its ability to pay the proffered wage and denied the petition accordingly.

On appeal, counsel indicated that he would submit a brief and/or evidence to the AAO within 30 days and stated the following: “[The petitioner clearly had the ability to pay the prevailing wage [sic] for this position.”

Counsel dated the appeal April 16, 2004. As of this date, more than 18 months later, the AAO has received nothing further. The AAO sent a fax to counsel on September 1, 2005 informing counsel that no separate brief and/or evidence was received to confirm whether or not he would send anything else in this matter, and as a courtesy, providing him with five (5) days to respond. To date, more than three weeks later, no reply has been received.

As stated in 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v), an appeal shall be summarily dismissed if the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

Counsel here has not specifically addressed the reasons stated for denial and has not provided any additional evidence. He has not even expressed disagreement with the director's decision. The appeal must therefore be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.